

April 27, 2004

Michigan Supreme Court
Clerk's Office
P.O. Box 30052
Lansing, MI 48909

Re: Supreme Court ADM2003-04

Please accept this missive in response to your request for the input of opinions regarding the proposed changes to the 6.500 motion. I will be responding to four proposed changes and I pray that my response will be considered in due time.

The proposed twenty-five page limit is too restrictive for people not astute in legal jargon to file a brief. Federal Courts permit fifty page briefs and apparently have no problems adjudicating cases, so why should Michigan Courts?

The rule prohibiting second motions for relief from judgment will unfairly impact those not astute in law; who because of their ignorance might overlook valid issues the first time. Of course here I am referring to those who because of indigency may not be able to retain counsel and will have to proceed pro se.

As alluded to above, those who have ineffective assistance of counsel issues or lack the finances to obtain competent counsel will be left defenseless. trapped in a legal quagmire.

The proposed one year limitation does not provide enough time for an illiterate pro se litigant to present legitimate claims.

Hopefully, you will include my responses to your website and will take them into consideration as you ponder these changes.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlton Nixon

Carlton Nixon #132473
Mound Road Correctional Facility
17601 Mound Road
Detroit, MI 48212

